CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM
RELEASE IN FULL

JFK ACT 01-12-99 RELEASE

CIA HAS NO OBJECTION TO
DECLASSIFICATION AND/OR
RELEASE OF CIA INFORMATION
IN THIS DOCUMENT

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of findings and recommendations	1
Introduction	9
History of the committee	9
Nature and scope of the investigation	10
Structure of the investigation	18
I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy	21
Introduction: The Kennedy Presidency in perspective	21
Presidential assassinations in the United States	21
A new President	24
Foreign affairs: A fragile peace	25
The Cuban threat	25
Combatting Communism in Latin America	27
The arms race	27
The missile crisis	27
Southeast Asia	28
Pledge to defend Europe	28
Cold war thaw	29
Growing involvement in Vietnam	29
Détente	30
At home: A troubled land	30
Civil rights progress	30
Economic policies	32
Government reform	33
War on organized crime	33
Opposition from the far right	34
November 1963: A trip to Texas	35
A. Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots at President John F. Kennedy. The second and third shots he fired struck the President. The third shot he fired killed the President	41
1. President Kennedy was struck by two rifle shots fired from behind him	41
(a) Reliance on scientific analysis	42
(1) The medical evidence	42
(2) Reaction times and alinement	44
(3) Neutron activation analysis	45
(4) Photographic evidence	45
(5) Acoustical evidence and blur analysis	46
2. The shots that struck President Kennedy from behind were fired from the sixth floor window of the southeast corner of the Texas School Book Depository building	47
(a) Scientific analysis	47
(1) Trajectory analysis	48
(2) Photographic evidence	49
(b) Witness testimony	49
(c) Firearms evidence	50
(d) Summary of the evidence	51
3. Lee Harvey Oswald owned the rifle that was used to fire the shots from the sixth floor window of the southeast corner of the Texas School Book Depository building	52
(a) Biography of Lee Harvey Oswald	52
(b) The committee's approach	54
(1) Handwriting analysis	54
(2) The backyard photographs	54

104-10427-10054

Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

A. Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots—Continued

	Page
4. Lee Harvey Oswald, shortly before the assassination, had access to and was present on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository building	56
(a) Testimony of book depository employees	57
(b) Physical evidence of Oswald's presence	57
(c) Oswald's whereabouts	57
(1) Lovelady or Oswald?	58
(2) Witness testimony	58
5. Lee Harvey Oswald's other actions tend to support the conclusion that he assassinated President Kennedy	59
(a) The Tippit murder	59
(b) Oswald: A capacity for violence?	60
(c) The motive	61
B. Scientific acoustical evidence establishes a high probability that two gunmen fired at President John F. Kennedy. Other scientific evidence does not preclude the possibility of two gunmen firing at the President. Scientific evidence negates some specific conspiracy allegations	65
(a) Warren Commission analysis of a tape	65
(b) Dallas Police Department recordings	66
(1) Analysis by Bolt Beranek and Newman	66
(2) Weiss-Aschkenasy analysis	72
(3) Search for a motorcycle	75
(c) Other evidence with respect to the shots	79
(d) Witness testimony on the shots	87
(1) Analysis of the reliability of witness testimony	90
(e) Certain conspiracy allegations	91
(f) Summary of the evidence	93
C. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that President John F. Kennedy was probably assassinated as a result of a conspiracy. The committee was unable to identify the other gunmen or the extent of the conspiracy	95
1. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the Soviet Government was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy	99
(a) United States-Soviet relations	99
(b) The Warren Commission investigation	99
(c) The committee's investigation	99
(1) Oswald in the U.S.S.R	100
(2) Treatment of defectors by the Soviet Government	100
(3) Yuri Nosenko	101
(4) Opinions of other defectors	102
(5) Marina Oswald	102
(6) Response of the Soviet Government	103
(d) Summary of the evidence	103
2. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the Cuban Government was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy	103
(a) United States-Cuban relations	104
(1) Bay of Pigs	105
(2) Cuban missile crisis	105
(b) Earlier investigations of Cuban complicity	106
(1) The Warren Commission investigation	107
(2) The U.S. Senate investigation	107
(3) The CIA's response to the Senate	108

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

C. The committee—Continued

	Page
2. The committee—Continued	
(c) The committee's analysis of the CIA task force report	109
(1) AMLASH	111
(2) CIA-Mafia plots	114
(3) Summary of the evidence	117
(d) Cubana Airlines flight allegation	117
(e) Gilberto Policarpo Lopez allegation	118
(f) Other allegations	121
(g) The committee's trip to Cuba	126
(h) Deficiencies of the 1963–64 investigation	127
(i) Summary of the findings	129
3. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that anti-Castro Cuban groups, as groups, were not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, but that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that individual members may have been involved	129
(a) The anti-Castro Cuban perspective	130
(1) The missile crisis and its aftermath	132
(2) Attitude of anti-Castro Cubans toward Kennedy	132
(b) The committee investigation	133
(1) Homer S. Echevarria	133
(2) Antonio Veciana Blanch	135
(3) Silvia Odio	137
(c) Oswald and anti-Castro Cubans	139
(1) Oswald in New Orleans	140
(2) Oswald in Clinton, La	142
(3) David Ferrie	143
(4) 544 Camp Street	143
(5) A committee analysis of Oswald in New Orleans	145
(6) Summary of the evidence	146
4. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the national syndicate of organized crime, as a group, was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, but that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that individual members may have been involved	147
(a) The Warren Commission investigation	148
(b) The committee investigation	149
(1) Ruby and organized crime	149
(2) Ruby and the Dallas Police Department	156
(3) Other evidence relating to Ruby	158
(4) Involvement of organized crime	159
(5) Analysis of the 1963–64 investigation	168
(6) Carlos Marcello	169
(7) Santos Trafficante	172
(8) James R. Hoffa	176
(c) Summary and analysis of the evidence	179
5. The Secret Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Central Intelligence Agency were not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy	181
(a) The Secret Service	181
(1) Connally testimony	182
(2) Choice of the motorcade route	182
(3) Allegation a Secret Service agent was on the grassy knoll	183
(4) Conclusion	184

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued
C. The committee—Continued
5. The Secret Service, FBI—Continued
Page
(b) The Federal Bureau of Investigation 185
(1) Early rumors that Oswald was an informant 185
(2) The Hosty entry in Oswald's address book 186
(3) FBI contacts with Oswald (Fort Worth, 1962) 190
(4) FBI contacts with Oswald (New Orleans, 1963) 191
(5) FBI contacts with Oswald (Dallas, 1963) 194
(6) The destruction of Oswald's note 195
(7) Conclusion 196
(c) The Central Intelligence Agency 196
(1) CIA personnel in the Soviet Russia Division 198
(2) CIA personnel abroad 198
(3) Oswald's CIA file 200
(4) Why the delay in opening Oswald's 201 file? 200
(5) Why was he carried as Lee Henry Oswald in his 201 file? 202
(6) The meaning of "AG" under "Other identification" in Oswald's 201 file 202
(7) Why was Oswald's 201 file restricted? 203
(8) Were 37 documents missing from Oswald's 201 file? 203
(9) Did the CIA maintain a dual filing system on Oswald? 204
(10) Did Oswald ever participate in a CIA counterintelligence project? 205
(11) Did the CIA ever debrief Oswald? 207
(12) The Justice Department's failure to prosecute Oswald 209
(13) Oswald's trip to Russia via Helsinki and his ability to obtain a visa in 2 days 211
(14) Oswald's contact with Americans in the Soviet Union 213
(15) Alleged intelligence contacts after Oswald returned from Russia 217
(16) Alleged intelligence implications of Oswald's military service 219
(17) Oswald's military intelligence file 221
(18) The Oswald photograph in Office of Naval Intelligence files 224
(19) Oswald in Mexico City 225
Conclusion 225
D. Agencies and departments of the U.S. Government performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfillment of their duties. President John F. Kennedy did not receive adequate protection. A thorough and reliable investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination was conducted. The investigation into the possibility of conspiracy in the assassination was inadequate. The conclusions of the investigations were arrived at in good faith, but presented in a fashion that was too definitive 227
1. The Secret Service was deficient in the performance of its duties 227

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued
D. Agencies and departments—Continued
1. The Secret Service—Continued
(a) The Secret Service possessed information that was not properly analyzed, investigated or used by the Secret Service in connection with the President's trip to Dallas; in addition, Secret Service agents in the motorcade were inadequately prepared to protect the President from a sniper
Page
228
(1) The committee approach 228
(2) Significant threats in 1963 230
(3) Inspection of the motorcade route 233
(4) Performance at the time of the assassination 234
(b) The responsibility of the Secret Service to investigate the assassination was terminated when the Federal Bureau of Investigation assumed primary investigative responsibility 236
2. The Department of Justice failed to exercise initiative in supervising and directing the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the assassination 237
3. The Federal Bureau of Investigation performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfillment of its duties 239
(a) The Federal Bureau of Investigation adequately investigated Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the assassination and properly evaluated the evidence it possessed to assess his potential to endanger the public safety in a national emergency 239
(b) The Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted a thorough and professional investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination 239
(c) The Federal Bureau of Investigation failed to investigate adequately the possibility of a conspiracy to assassinate the President 239
(d) The Federal Bureau of Investigation was deficient in its sharing of information with other agencies and departments 239
(1) History of the FBI 239
(2) The FBI investigation 241
4. The Central Intelligence Agency was deficient in its collection and sharing of information both prior to and subsequent to the assassination 246
(a) Establishment of the CIA 246
(b) Rockefeller Commission investigation of CIA activities 248
(c) The committee investigation 248
(1) CIA preassassination performance—Oswald in Mexico City 248
(2) The CIA and the Warren Commission 252
(3) Post-Warren report CIA investigation 255
5. The Warren Commission performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfillment of its duties 256
(a) The Warren Commission conducted a thorough and professional investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination 256

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued
D. Agencies and departments—Continued
5. The Warren Commission—Continued
(b) The Warren Commission failed to investigate adequately the possibility of a conspiracy to assassinate the President. This deficiency was attributable in part to the failure of the Commission to receive all the relevant information that was in the possession of other agencies and departments of the Government — Page 256
(c) The Warren Commission arrived at its conclusions, based on the evidence available to it, in good faith — 256
(d) The Warren Commission presented the conclusions in its report in a fashion that was too definitive — 256
II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations in the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr — 263
Introduction: The civil rights movement and Dr. King — 263
A history of civil rights violence — 263
Equality in education—the 20th century objective — 265
A new leader emerges — 266
A philosophy of nonviolence — 268
1960: The year of the sit-ins — 268
1963: A year of triumph and despair — 270
The road to Memphis — 277
The last moments: Memphis, Tenn., April 4, 1968 — 282
A. James Earl Ray fired one shot at Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The shot killed Dr. King — 287
(a) Biography of James Earl Ray — 287
(b) The committee's investigation — 288
1. Dr. King was killed by one shot fired from in front of him — 289
2. The shot that killed Dr. King was fired from the bathroom window at the rear of a roominghouse at 422½ South Main Street, Memphis, Tenn — 290
3. James Earl Ray purchased the rifle that was used to shoot Dr. King and transported it from Birmingham, Ala., to Memphis, Tenn., where he rented a room at 422½ South Main Street, and moments after the assassination, he dropped it near 424 South Main Street — 293
4. It is highly probable that James Earl Ray stalked Dr. King for a period immediately preceding the assassination — 296
5. James Earl Ray fled the scene of the crime immediately after the assassination — 299
6. James Earl Ray's alibi for the time of the assassination, his story of "Raoul," and other allegedly exculpatory evidence are not worthy of belief — 303
(a) Ray's alibi — 303
(b) Ray's "Raoul" story — 305
(1) Conflicting descriptions of Raoul — 305
(2) Absence of witnesses to corroborate Raoul's existence — 305
(c) Preassassination transactions — 306
(1) The rifle purchase — 307
(2) Fingerprints on the rifle — 308
(3) Rental of room 5–B at Bessie Brewer's roominghouse — 309
(4) The binocular purchase — 310
(d) Grace Walden Stephens — 310

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations.—Continued
A. James Earl Ray fired one shot at Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., The shot killed Dr. King—Continued
7. James Earl Ray knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily pleaded guilty to the first degree murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr — Page 315
(a) Irreconcilable conflicts of interest of Foreman and Hanes — 318
(b) Foreman's failure to investigate the case — 319
(c) Coercion by Foreman and the Federal Government — 321
(d) Ray's belief a guilty plea would not preclude a new trial — 323
B. The committee believes, on the basis of the circumstantial evidence available to it, that there is a likelihood that James Earl Ray assassinated Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as a result of a conspiracy — 325
1. The FBI investigation — 325
2. The committee investigation — 326
(a) Transactional analysis — 326
(b) Ray's associates examined — 326
3. Investigation of Ray's motive — 327
(a) Ray's racial attitudes examined — 327
(b) Ego gratification as a motive — 330
(c) The prospect of financial reward — 331
(d) Conclusion on motive — 333
4. General indications of conspiracy — 333
(a) Transactions as evidence of associations — 334
5. The brothers, John and Jerry Ray — 336
(a) Evidence of Ray's contact with his brothers, 1967–68 — 337
(b) Missouri State Penitentiary escape — 339
(c) The Alton bank robbery — 342
(1) Bank robbery modus operandi analysis — 348
(d) A brother was Raoul — 350
(e) The brothers and the rifle purchase — 354
(f) Motive with respect to John and Jerry Ray — 358
6. Evidence of a conspiracy in St. Louis — 359
(a) The Byers allegation — 360
(b) The backgrounds of Kauffmann and Sutherland — 364
(c) Connectives to James Earl Ray — 366
7. Conclusion — 371
C. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that no private organizations or individuals, other than those discussed under section B, were involved in the assassination of Dr. King — 375
1. Rightwing extremist organizations — 375
(a) The Minutemen — 375
(b) Klan organizations — 377
(c) J. B. Stoner — 381
(d) William Hugh Morris — 382
2. Conspiracy allegations: Memphis — 383
(a) Citizen's band radio broadcast — 383
(b) John McFerren — 385
3. Conspiracy allegations: New Orleans — 387
(a) William Sartor — 387
(b) Raul Esquivel — 389
(c) Reynard Rochon — 390
(d) Herman Thompson — 390
(e) Jules Ricco Kimble — 392
(f) Randy Rosenson — 393

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued
C. The committee believes, etc.—Continued Page
4. Conspiracy allegations: Atlanta 394
(a) Edna Matthews Lancaster 394
(b) Claude and Leon Powell 394
(c) Robert Byron Watson 395
5. Conspiracy allegations: Birmingham 396
(a) Morris Davis 396
(b) Walter Maddox 398
6. Conspiracy allegations: Louisville 399
(a) Clifton Baird 399
(b) Charles Lee Bell 400
7. Conspiracy allegations: St. Louis 401
(a) Delano Elmer Walker 401
8. Conspiracy allegations: Miami 402
(a) William Somersett 402
9. Conspiracy allegations: Texas 404
(a) Otis Moore 404
10. Conspiracy allegations: New York 404
(a) Myron Billett 404
D. No Federal, State or local government agency was involved in the assassination of Dr. King 407
1. The Federal Bureau of Investigation 407
(a) The Lorraine Motel issue 409
(b) The inciting of violence by informants issue 411
(c) The FBI foreknowledge issue 413
(d) The FBI assistance for Ray issue 414
(e) FBI surveillance files in the National Archives 415
2. Memphis Police Department 416
(a) Withdrawal of the security detail 417
(b) The removal of Detective Redditt 418
(c) The transfer of two Black firemen 423
(d) The postassassination performance of the Memphis police 424
3. Missouri State Penitentiary 428
E. The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation performed with varying degrees of competency and legality in the fulfillment of their duties 431
1. The Department of Justice failed to supervise adequately the Domestic Intelligence Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the Domestic Intelligence Division's COINTELPRO campaign against Dr. King, grossly abused and exceeded its legal authority and failed to consider the possibility that actions threatening bodily harm to Dr. King might be encouraged by the program 431
(a) Security investigation and COINTELPRO 432
(1) Hoover's dislike for Dr. King 434
(2) Electronic surveillance of Dr. King 436
(3) Manipulation of the media 437
(4) Analysis of the impact of the FBI-inspired editorial 439
2. The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation performed a thorough investigation into the responsibility of James Earl Ray for the assassination of Dr. King, and conducted a thorough fugitive investigation, but failed to investigate adequately the possibility of conspiracy in the assassination. The Federal Bureau of Investigation manifested a lack of concern for constitutional rights in the manner in which it conducted parts of the investigation 441
(a) The FBI chain of command 442

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued
E. The Department of Justice, etc.—Continued
2. The Department of Justice, etc.—Continued Page
(b) The fugitive investigation 443
(1) James Earl Ray identified 445
(2) Surveillance of Ray family considered 446
(3) Ray arrested in London 449
(c) The conspiracy investigation 449
(1) The method 450
(2) The focus 453
(d) Investigative excesses 456
(e) Conclusion 459
III. Recommendations of the Select Committee on Assassinations 461
A. Legislative recommendations on issues involving the prohibition, prevention and prosecution of assassinations and federally cognizable homicides 464
(a) Prohibition and prevention 464
(b) Prosecution 472
B. Administrative recommendations to the executive 473
C. General recommendations for congressional investigations 475
D. Recommendations for further investigation 480
IV. Separate Remarks, Views and Dissent of Members of the Committee 483
Separate remarks of Christopher J. Dodd 483
Separate views of Samuel L. Devine and Robert W. Edgar 491
Dissent of Robert W. Edgar 494
Dissent of Harold S. Sawyer 503
Appendix I: Staff of the Select Committee on Assassinations 513
Appendix II: Consultants to the Select Committee on Assassinations 516
Appendix III: Contractors for the Select Committee on Assassinations 519
Appendix IV: Statistical data and expenditures 520
Appendix V: Affirmative action program 533
Appendix VI: Enabling resolutions 534
Appendix VII: Index for the investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy 573
A. Public hearings of the committee 573
B. Exhibits—John F. Kennedy public hearings 574
C. Supplemental exhibits—John F. Kennedy public hearings 583
D. Appendices to the John F. Kennedy public hearings 583
Appendix VIII: Index for the investigation of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr 584
A. Public hearings of the committee 584
B. Exhibits—Martin Luther King, Jr. public hearings 585
C. Appendices to the Martin Luther King, Jr. public hearings 592
Appendix IX: Index for the public hearings of the Committee on Legislative and Administrative Reform 593
References for the:
Introduction 595
I. Report on the investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy 597
II. Report on the investigation of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr 645
III. Recommendations of the committee 683

problems that Mr. Nosenko had, and that in the light of all of this, he would be inclined to discount the specifics of his testimony on Oswald.

I do not think that this calls into challenge the credibility of everything else Mr. Nosenko said. In fact as Mr. Hart indicated he did provide the Agency with some very valuable information, information that turned out to be correct.

Finally, as I indicated, his services to the Agency, today, are generally describing the atmosphere and general techniques that are used by the CIA, and do not get into specific questions.

Mr. FITHIAN. I am troubled a bit more by one part of that comment, I guess, than I was when I started out on this quest.

Perhaps we see the whole issue of assassinations as something more than a narrow focus, because that is the main purpose of the committee, but I would argue the case historically that when they were first interrogating Mr. Nosenko, when the Warren Commission was operating, that the request for all the facts surrounding the President of the United States would have been extraordinarily important, and therefore could reasonably be expected if the CIA was on the ball to be a very, very important question as to whether or not the person who has just been killed himself and who had previously been the chief suspect of having killed the President, that what he did or did not do in Russia would be a terribly important thing to the CIA.

Therefore, I could not pass it off as being not as important as some of the other things you are going to tell us, unless I am to agree that in your methods, your process and your sources are more important than the assassination of the President of the United States. That would bother me deeply if we were to close out the investigation on that note.

Mr. CARLUCCI. If I may clarify, I think I was describing Mr. Hart's testimony to you, and I believe he was describing a factual situation. I was certainly not passing judgment or giving approval in any sense to the way Mr. Nosenko was interrogated or handled.

Mr. FITHIAN. I was not referring to the way he was handled, either, in terms of the focus. I am just trying to focus in on the importance to the country of the individuals that the CIA had in its hands at the time.

Mr. CARLUCCI. I would not disagree with you. I suppose if I had been making the interrogation and happened to have the expertise necessary to do that, I would have liked to be able to say I would put more emphasis on the Oswald question, but I think the facts of the matter are that those in charge of the interrogation at that time did not put that much emphasis on it.

Mr. FITHIAN. One further quick question, Mr. Chairman, and then I will subside.

What I am trying to get at is whether or not the philosophy of the CIA has changed basically from 1964 to 1978, and that is this:

Is the protection of a source more important, in that case and in future cases, than any possible assassinations of the President? When it comes down to a real crunch it is more important to protect that source than it is to cooperate with the Warren Commission who is trying to get at the story of the killing in the United States.

Mr. CARLUCCI. I don't know th
answer to the protection of sources,
clearly that there have been insta
mation on potential violence, and
have put a source in jeopardy.

You have to weigh the merits in
the Warren Commission I don't kn
sources. My understanding is that t
ties was not provided simply becau
age between the two.

I don't know. I was not around, bu
to protect sources. Certainly, as I in
make every effort to turn over a
Commission, and in many cases to
don't need to know the source if you

That is one of the fundamental pr
put out intelligence reports in such
information yet withhold the sourc
for such a Commission to know the
be in a sensitive position, my judgm
would probably tell them but reques

They could then protect the sou
with some confidence on the inform
the source. So the answer is that w
coming as possible, recognizing that
may be putting people's lives in dan
judgment call in each one of these ins

Mr. FITHIAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair

Chairman STOKES. The time of the g

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman STOKES. The gentleman

Mr. DODD. I would like to follow u
Fithian raised and, without in any
what may be security matters, there
tion, or shortly thereafter, a photogr
originally identified as Lee Harvey Os

Subsequently, the identification of
to be Lee Harvey Oswald, but over t
has been all sorts of speculation as t
Mexico at the time.

To your knowledge, has the Agenc
that individual?

Mr. CARLUCCI. No, sir; we have not.

Mr. DODD. The reason I raise it is
category as Mr. Fithian's question wi
tion of sources and information.

I think you adequately responded
curious as to that specific piece of evid

Mr. CARLUCCI. No, we have not been

Mr. DODD. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman STOKES. Any other membe
All right.